

SCAAC Meeting Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

November 10, 1998
State Board Room

SCAAC Agenda

#	Agenda Items	Presenters
1.	Meeting Minutes	Anne Keene
2.	Revised School Report Card Model	Angela Wilkins/ Laura Graham
3.	Accountability Models	Scott Trimble/ John Poggio
Adjournment		

SCAAC Meeting Minutes November 10, 1998

Copies of audiotapes of the meeting are available upon request.
Chairperson Anne Keene called the meeting to order. Jon Frederick called the roll.

Members Present:

Jon Akers	Anne Keene	Maynard Thomas
Kay Freeland	Benny Lile	Sharon Whitworth
Suzanne Guyer	Gary Mielcarek	Robert Young
Maxie Johnson	Roger Pankratz	

1. Meeting Minutes

Anne Keene

A quorum was present. Chairperson Anne Keene outlined the agenda for the session which included discussion and review of the school report card, the index and accountability models, and the National Technical Advisory Panel for Assessment and Accountability Model.

SCAAC Motion:

Chairperson Anne Keene asked the Council to review the October 14 minutes for revision. Maynard Thomas moved the minutes be approved with the corrections and revisions made. Roger Pankratz seconded the motion and the motion passed without opposition.

Meeting Time 7 hours and 15 minutes

2. Revised School Report Card Model

**Angela Wilkins/
Laura Graham**

The Chair recognized Angela Wilkins and Laura Graham to present the updated and revised school report card model. Angela noted that the past input had been incorporated into the work in progress draft. Every effort is being made to be responsive to the changes recommended. Angela reported that she and Laura had reported to various groups and received comments and suggestions for streamlining the report card. A mock-up of the most recent school report card was handed out for review. Deputy Commissioner Gene Wilhoit noted some of the additions to the school report card, particularly in the area of school safety. He noted that larger schools noted that numbers in these kinds of items might be inflated due to school population. Gene also noted that there was a variance in policies from district to district and school to school--in short there is a lack of consistency in discipline policies.

The question is one of fairness; how do we present the data in a format that is fair and consistent from school to school. Jon Akers asked if the same format would apply to all grade levels—elementary, middle and high school. Laura Graham noted that there would be consistency but the format varied slightly for each level. Angela Wilkins gave the rationalization for the two approaches presented; other advisory groups had recommended certain specific changes and those are reflected in the mock-ups. The Council discussed school safety components on the school report cards.

Angela Wilkins noted the part of the school report card in which the number of expulsions is included within the school safety information section of the report card. Roger Pankratz suggested that the line "Our Score" be placed under the charts which provide Kentucky Core Content Tests scores. He noted that the school index would fit there more appropriately. Discussion followed on the rationale for inclusion of school index on the report card; more explanation would be necessary to define that data or number. Options were discussed. Maynard Thomas noted that the front page chart of information about students was supposed to be part of the Tier 2 components.

Jon Akers noted that there would be parents who would wish to see state and district scores so that a comparison could be made among the schools in the district and those in the state. Providing such data would give a reference point for local and state wide comparison.

Benny Lile suggested that Norm Reference Tests score reports should show national percentiles. The suggestion stems from the perception that parents want to see how their students perform relative to students who take that same NRT across the country. Roger Pankratz opposed putting Normal Curve Equivalents on the report card because parents would not understand Normal Curve Equivalents. Council members Suzanne Guyer and Benny Lile supported Roger's position. The question before the Council is whether to change Normal Curve Equivalents to national percentiles.

SCAAC Motion:

Benny Lile moved that the Council recommend not using Normal Curve Equivalents on the school report card and instead use national percentiles. The motion was seconded by Kay Freeland. Discussion followed. KBE Chairperson Helen Mountjoy asked the Council if the motion under consideration would provide data which would be understandable by the public/parents? Scott Trimble noted that the percentiles produced would not provide an accurate comparison of local schools with all other schools in the country. The question was called and Benny Lile's motion carried without opposition. The Council recommended that Kentucky parents have input into the format and content of school report cards.

SCAAC Discussion:

Sharon Whitworth requested that the language "security personnel" and "security equipment" be stricken from the report card as that was the Council's recommendation during previous discussions. It was agreed that those lines would be deleted.

Jon Akers suggested that for consistency sake that the same data with local, state, and national scores be included in each section of the report card where applicable.

The Council next discussed parental/family/community involvement components on the report card. The degree and breadth of what is furnished on the report card was the focus of the discussion. In regard to the glossary on the last page of the school report card, Kay Freeland suggested that the definitions should be written more simply and user- friendly for the targeted audience of parents. It was agreed that the language of the glossary would be revised.

Helen Mountjoy noted that the Tier 1 document omitted any report of adjudicated arts which is required in the language of House Bill 53. This component will be added to the school report card.

At this point, Deputy Commissioner Wilhoit asked the Council if the department could work on reducing the three tiered report card to two tiers.

SCAAC Motion:

Sharon Whitworth moved the school report card be revised according to changes made at this meeting. The motion was seconded by Jon Akers. Motion carried.

Benny Lile moved that the three tiered approach be reduced to a two tiered report card. Sharon Whitworth seconded the motion. The motion carried.

The Chair called for a fifteen minute recess. It was noted that Bob Sexton was now in attendance.

Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the Council.

Angela Wilkins asked if the Council had any additional recommendations regarding the format and content of the school report cards. In particular, the question was whether or not the language on the report card seemed appropriate, clear, and accurate. Angela asked if the Council wanted to recommend that adjudicated arts be included in a separate box on the report card.

There was discussion about including the data concerning high school graduates who are enrolled in college remedial courses. Jon Akers suggested that that block on the report card be dropped. Maynard Thomas noted that the Council had previously included this data in the Tier 2 report card. The purpose of inclusion of such data was questioned.

SCAAC Motion:

Benny Lile moved to strike the data box on college remedial courses from the school report card. The motion was seconded by Jon Akers. Discussion followed about whether to strike this data from all levels of the school report card. One concern noted is the lack of any standards for what constitutes eligibility for remedial course work from one higher education institution to another. The motion carried.

Bob Sexton moved that the Council communicate to the Council on Higher Education that some standards or standard criteria on what constitutes eligibility for remedial college course work should be developed. Jon Akers seconded the motion. The motion carried.

3. Accountability Models

**Scott Trimble/
John Poggio**

Chairperson Anne Keene introduced Scott Trimble and John Poggio (NTAPAA representative) to present on the accountability models under consideration. Council members reviewed three sets of documents: the straight line accountability model, the NTAPAA model, and a document from the Kentucky Board of Education which sets forth the accountability issues.

Scott Trimble presented material on the Straight Line Accountability Model. Scott used the graphics and the narrative explanation of the model including features of a straight line model. Scott explained the models using the charts provided. (All Council members received copies of this printed material and it is not reproduced as text in the minutes).

At this point, Dr. John Poggio was recognized to discuss accountability models. Dr. Poggio noted that he did not feel that he would actually correct any of the information that Scott Trimble had presented. He went on to explain the NTAPAA Model proposed.

(Note: All Council members were provided with the NTAPAA model for review during Dr. Poggio's presentation and it is not included in the text of these meeting minutes.)

The four categories outlined be declined, maintained, progressed, and progressed strongly. Within each category there would be consequences and rewards. The nature of rewards, review, consequences would need to be defined further. Dr. Poggio noted that the NTAPAA model would allow for more variables in setting targets with specific expected growth percentages. The straight line model does set fixed targets and degrees of growth expected. In the NTAPAA Model progress is always rewarded. Dr. Poggio suggested that Kentucky has data that no one else has and should use that data in configuring the possibilities. Discussion continued on the possibilities of using data which will be released at the end of November to do further simulations of the practicality of the models. Basically, how realistic is a model/models? The ultimate consideration is that schools be able to meet the goals in the time frame set. Is the goal of 100 reachable on the 2014 timeline? Can the timeline be extended to 2020 with more realistic outcomes?

Kay Freeland asked Dr. Poggio if the goal of 100 is reasonable. In response, Dr. Poggio noted that the 100 mark is 70% of the 140 point and that he believes that is reasonable. Furthermore, Dr. Poggio suggested that the assessment should be designed so that schools can achieve at that level over time.

Benny Lile asked if this were the point at which the Council should discuss the score points--that is any changes in the NAPD (Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished) wherein there might be sub-points within each point of the scale. Such a change would allow for faster movement toward the 100 mark. Helen Mountjoy expressed her view that it is too difficult to move toward any unspecified goal.

Chairperson Anne Keene recessed the Council for lunch. After the lunch break, Chairperson Anne Keene reconvened the Council. A quorum was present.

The Chair recognized Scott Trimble to discuss two questions: 1. Are the standards we have now the correct standards? and 2. What are the implications of any changes in the standards? Adding cut points within novice and apprentice scores would cause the scores to move upward and make achievement of the 100 goal (70% of the 140) more noticeable. During the first years, indices would move to higher levels faster. The question is one of distinguishing more score points within a category, for example, valuing the score points at low or high levels--high novice or low apprentice would show improvement and growth in different ways.

Helen Mountjoy asked how the concept that more cut points in the scale would allow for more room for error would play out in reconfiguring the NAPD score points? Dr. John Poggio noted that on principle that concept was in fact correct. Students won't be impacted in their classification on scores, but the school classification would be altered.

SCAAC Motion:

Benny Lile moved that the Council recommend that the Board consider cut points within the novice and apprentice score points. Motion seconded by Bob Sexton. Suzanne Guyer noted that making these cut points would be perceived positively by educators and make the goal seem more realistic and attainable. Motion carried unanimously.

SCAAC Discussion:

The next question the Council discussed was a decision on which model the Council would recommend at this point between the two basic models presented to the Kentucky Board of Education. Bob Sexton asked Dr. Poggio to give some rationale for the NTAPAA model as more being preferable. In answer, Dr. Poggio said that NTAPAA was in part responding to issues which had been raised concerning other models and/or past models. He noted that the same questions which had been asked by the Council relative to how attainable the goal of 100 would be is relevant in this discussion. He also noted that NTAPAA recommended that it would be essential to have an appeals structure in place--a way for schools to appeal the appropriateness of their classifications. He stated that there are no perfect models or magic numbers which would garner 100% support; any model would have problems which would have to deal the validity of the target numbers and time frames.

Bob Young asked Dr. Poggio to articulate what he saw as the difference between the NTAPAA model and the straight line model (Chart A). His answer was that the straight line model would require schools in decline to make up ground to progress more quickly. Furthermore, Dr. Poggio noted that there was not much dramatic difference in the two models, and that one did not have a fatal flaw which would pre-empt its acceptability or reasonableness.

Roger Pankratz asked how a new accountability model would be perceived by schools? Are there fairness issues that stand out? Council member Maxie Johnson expressed her opinion that at the elementary level it would very difficult for elementary schools to make up the ground necessary to achieve the 100 goal by 2014. Maxie sees

part of the answer to addressing elementary problems as one of professional development which could address some of these very basic and systemic needs. Funding to meet those needs must be appropriated so that these needs are met sufficiently. Suzanne Guyer noted her concerns that teachers need support in the way of smaller class sizes, more planning time, and more instructional assistance in order to gain confidence that any accountability model which sets high goals and specific time frames for achievement would be attainable.

Bob Young expressed his support for the NTAPAA model because he sees the potential for success in the long run. Maynard Thomas suggested that the Council table this discussion and any specific recommendation on an accountability model until more data is available. Anne Keene expressed her feeling that any projections based on past KIRIS assessment may not be very revealing as to the ability of schools to reach the 100 goal. In part, she believes this is true because of changes in the assessment itself and changes to the system.

Benny Lile asked for clarification on the NTAPAA Model. He noted that without the values of the X's in the model, there could not be a realistic way to evaluate how the model would perform. Benny also noted that there would be considerable room for schools to bounce around from decline to progressing, much in the same way that the old KIRIS model performed and was criticized for as one of its basic weaknesses. Dr. Poggio's response to the questions and discussion was that he would definitely have recommended that the straight line model be abandoned if he or the NTAPAA had felt that such a model was not feasible. He noted that NTAPAA was not of that opinion.

Bob Sexton expressed his preference to go to the legislature and demand more support to reach the goals and provide a quality education, rather than having a compromised goal which doesn't produce significantly better educational opportunities and results.

Bob Young asked if there were any way to alter the straight line model to include some desirable features of the NTAPAA Model? Dr. Poggio expressed doubt that that would be possible.

Scott Trimble discussed a variation of the straight line model which allowed for more tolerance in the growth and decline zones. Such a model would look like a fan rather than a straight line at the upper most part of the lines.

There was discussion of terminology on the straight line model with the use of "safety zone" having been omitted from the copy handed out at this meeting. The area labeled "progressing" should be the "safety zone." Scott Trimble explained why the "progressing" line came to be on the chart.

He offered to put whatever label or language into that slot that the Council desired as more appropriate.

SCAAC Motion:

The Chairperson asked for a motion on the accountability model. Maynard Thomas moved that the Council keep the model it had previously passed--straight line model (A). Motion seconded by Gary Mielcarek. Bob Young noted that he felt that had the Council had the NTAPAA's advice before its first decision that the choice might have been more like the model now presented by NTAPAA. Roll call vote was called. The vote resulted in a five to five tied vote. Voting nay were Suzanne Guyer, Maxie Johnson, Roger Pankratz, Bob Young, Sharon Whitworth. Those voting yes were Anne Keene, Benny Lile, Gary Mielcarek, Bob Sexton, and Maynard Thomas.

Following the vote Dr. John Poggio gave his observations concerning the vote and understandings from the points discussed. Roger Pankratz moved that the Council offer the following points: keep the straight line model, create celebration markers for schools which make progress, validation of the 100 goal , and extensions beyond 100.

The motion was seconded by Maxie Johnson. The motion carried without opposition.

Adjournment

SCAAC Motion:

Motion to adjourn by Maynard Thomas, seconded by Benny Lile. The Council adjourned.